

Utah State Building Board



TELECONFERENCE MEETING

August 21, 2000

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members on teleconference:

David Adams, Chair
Keith Stepan, Vice Chair
R. Haze Hunter
Joseph Jenkins
Kay Waxman
Lynne Ward (Ex-Officio)

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Richard E. Byfield, AIA	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Ken Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Francis X. Lilly	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Randa Bezzant	GOPB
Paul Platt	Courts
Randy Turpin	University of Utah
John W. Huish	University of Utah
Anne Racer	University of Utah
Larry Newton	State Office of Education
Angie Loving	Board of Regents
Lynn Samsel	Department of Human Services

On Monday, August 21, 2000, a Utah State Building Board teleconference meeting was held in 4112 State Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chairman David Adams called the meeting to order at 9:30a.m.

CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY DEFINITIONS

Chairman Adams asked Kent Beers of DFCM to discuss the project ranking category definitions, beginning with the emergency category. Mr. Beers stated the emergency category would rarely be used and he did not perceive any past or current project seen by the Building Board to identify as an example under the emergency category. The Utah State University

heat plant and steam piping could have fallen into the emergency category had funding not been committed last year.

Mr. Beers commented that projects in the critical need category represent what DFCM deems the highest and most immediate need for the current funding year. Richard Byfield commented the continuation of the USU infrastructure would represent a critical need, and the engineering building could be considered a critical need due to its life-safety issues. Mr. Byfield added he believed the CEU Main Building Complex represents a critical need, and the continuing need for classroom space at UVSC may as well. Mr. Beers noted the critical need category is not solely based on a building's condition; demand is also a factor.

Chairman Adams asked if DFCM staff was aware of UVSC's growth trend. Mr. Beers stated DFCM was aware of the growth trend and has noted the Board of Regents awareness of continuing growth at UVSC. Chairman Adams stated that, according to President Romesburg, UVSC's estimates have exceeded those of the Regents. Ken Nye stated the Regents have not run the space requests through their Q&P process, making it difficult for DFCM to identify additional classroom space at UVSC meeting the critical needs definition before the Q & P analysis is done. Mr. Byfield proposed DFCM provide the Building Board an analysis of needs using matrix A.

Chairman Adams requested examples of buildings falling under the urgent need category. Mr. Beers replied most of the projects not meeting the critical need threshold would probably be categorized as an urgent need. Mr. Byfield mentioned that the Oxbow project proposed by the Department of Corrections could be considered an urgent need.

Mr. Jenkins asked if there was enough information to categorize all the needs and verified that DFCM would like the Building Board to agree on a proposed matrix to allow the presentation of a needs analysis to the Board's October meeting. Chairman Adams mentioned the Board would also need to adopt the definitions in September and Mr. Hunter supported the definitions as they were written.

Mr. Byfield directed the Board's attention to item 'E' of the emergency needs definition which reads: "Facilities that have been declared unsafe or condemned by the State Building Official." DFCM would not want to promote agencies to condemn their buildings and he suggested striking item 'E' to not create an illusion those agencies would receive a funded replacement if they condemn a building. Chairman Adams recommended leaving off item 'E' when the definitions are presented to the Building Board in September.

Mr. Beers offered to provide the Building Board with an overview of each matrix. Under Strategy A, DFCM would assign a numerical value to each of the categorical definitions that

were described (emergency = 5, critical = 4, urgent = 3, etc). Each project would be listed in a column and several categories would be arrayed as rows. Staff would be developing the matrix, determining the level of need in each category for each building. Mr. Byfield added that Matrix A would aid the Building Board as a briefing paper. Mr. Beers stated condition assessments would be done by independent architects and engineers and would address life safety issues, the condition of the facility, and its function. The information is not opinion from the staff, but is derived from data from the condition assessments. Cost effectiveness would be determined by examining the proposed project and its cost estimate divided by the square footage.

Mr. Beers went on to discuss Strategy B, which employed the same method of analysis as Strategy A, with the exception that DFCM would rank the projects on the list within each category. Mr. Byfield mentioned both matrices could be provided by DFCM, with Strategy A demonstrating the categories, and the second would denote rank. Mr. Jenkins stated that he opposes Strategy B, as he felt it pre-empts the prerogative of the Building Board to rank the project. Strategy A could give the Building Board the necessary information to make the decision. Mr. Hunter offered that Strategy B gave more information on DFCM's impression. Mr. Jenkins stated that he does not believe that DFCM should be ranking projects. Chairman Adams replied that Strategy C gives the Building Board the option to rank. He then stated that he was uncertain if the Building Board understood the differences between Strategies A and B.

Mr. Beers cited as an example under Strategy A, in the life-safety category, the CEU Main Building, the UVSC Classroom Building, and the USU Engineering Building would be deemed critical. Under Strategy B, DFCM would state the Engineering Building under life safety is the *most* critical (1), the CEU Main Building would be the second most critical (2), and so on. In Strategy B, no two buildings would have the same ranking, unlike Strategy A. Chairman Adams mentioned he would like the Building Board to focus on Strategy C while the staff works on Strategy B, so that no two buildings would have the same rating in any category.

Mr. Beers suggested if the Building Board were to go to Strategy C and develop their own rankings, Staff could develop Strategy A for public dissemination. Mr. Byfield stated that if the Building Board was to compile Strategy C, and staff was to work on Strategy A, the crib sheets could be compared. Mr. Beers added that, last year, Higher Education paid to have a number of buildings evaluated for life-safety, including the USU Engineering Building, the Dixie College Graff Building, Snow College Crane Theatre, and the CEU Main Building. While each project could have been considered critical, it was clear that there was an order as to which project was the most critical. Strategy B would give DFCM the opportunity to decide what is most critical in each category. Mr. Beers suggested that Board members desiring further input from staff could call to receive staff's opinion if Strategy A were adopted and

Board members desired further input from staff.

Chairman Adams stated that the Building Board would like for DFCM to adopt Strategy A. Staff should be available to answer specific questions from the members of the Building Board. Strategy C would reflect the final tally of the Building Board. The Building Board agreed. Chairman Adams requested the decisions for each strategy is footnoted on the matrices. As for Strategy B, he recommended that staff input take place on an individual basis with the Building Board members. The strategy will formally be adopted at their next meeting.

❑ **SHORT LIST**.....

Kent Beers presented the short list of projects that DFCM is recommending that the Board review this year (FY2002). Agencies that want to petition the Board to be added to the list will have that opportunity at the September Board meeting. Kent Beers then reviewed the total requests from Higher Education \$165,512,000, Public Education \$4,900,000 and State Agencies \$58,900,000 for a grand total of \$229 million, excluding the Capitol Preservation Board and Capital Improvement Funding. Chairman Adams mentioned a meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 23 to lay the groundwork for the budget request for the Capitol.

Chairman Adams clarified that September would be an opportunity for any agency wishing to speak. Mr. Beers stated the petitions should be limited to five minutes and should not take place of the October hearings. Chairman Adams asked if the petitions should be voted up or down by the Building Board as they are presented to which Mr. Byfield confirmed. Chairman Adams stated the agenda for the October hearing would consist of the short list, plus any projects agreed to at the September meeting. Mr. Beers recommended the Building Board put under great scrutiny any request from an agency or institution to be added to the short list, as there is inadequate funding for the short list as it stands.

❑ **TOUR DISCUSSIONS**.....

Joe Jenkins spoke his sentiments on the tours and stated the Building Board seems to feel they should try to handle needs on the basis of their capital improvement funds. Some authority should be delegated to schools to make improvements to their buildings. Mr. Byfield stated DFCM has commissioned engineers and architects to travel to Southern Utah University to look at the middle school. While DFCM does not have the report, or the status of the feasibility of re-using the facility, DFCM anticipates having a recommendation by the time of the hearings. DFCM is seeking data on a five-year use plan and a twenty-year use plan.

❑ OTHER

Ken Nye of DFCM updated the Board on the condition of Mr. Chuck Canfield of the Utah State Building Board.

Mr. Byfield stated the Bridgerland ATC medical space addition project began in January with a completion date of August 15th. On August 16th, Mr. Byfield and Mr. Robert Woodhead toured the completed facility. Dr. Richard Maughn, Superintendent, was elated the project was on schedule and there were no change orders. DFCM was able to complete the project a full academic year ahead of schedule.

Chairman Adams asked Mr. Jenkins for his statements on the final Value-Based Selection Task Force meeting. Mr. Jenkins stated the conclusions the task force arrived at are similar to the ones at the last Board meeting. At the next Building Board meeting, they will begin the process of writing a rule. A more complete review is due at the next Building Board meeting, however current information is available on the web site.

Chairman Adams asked for an update on the Capital Needs Assessment Program. Mr. Byfield replied DFCM is anticipating the return of Mr. Jack Quintana after September 1. He hopefully will be able to provide an update at the September meeting, as he has been the individual in charge of the Capital Needs Assessment program. Chairman Adams requested Kent Beers make the presentation if Mr. Quintana is unavailable.

Chairman Adams thanked the Board members for their participation in the teleconference. He implored the Building Board to prepare for a full day at their next meeting on September 7. The October meeting is to be held on October 3 and 4. Chairman Adams noted the UEA holiday and the Board agreed to focus on the October 4 vote.

❑ ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 AM.

Minutes prepared by: Francis X. Lilly